

From: "Carol Pollock (SBC)" <carol_pollock@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/29/2005 11:29:44 AM
Subject: Regarding the proposed Burton Creek additions

To: Ken Anderson

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am a frequent Tahoe visitor and Tahoe City homeowner and would like to comment on the proposed Burton Creek Park development.

We are deeply concerned and opposed to the Individual Campsites and any large Group sites.

*The fire risk and air pollution issue from even 50 campsites is enormous.

*The traffic consequences for travel on Highway 28 are huge. Putting a significant number of additional cars on that road is hard to imagine during busy summer days.

*Access on existing roads into Burton Creek would have an extremely negative impact on nearby residents. Right now the streets are dangerous to anyone walking on the road, children and animals.

*Finally, on a quality of life issue, you may not have any idea how sound travels throughout the area. Please come join me on the deck of our Tahoe cabin anytime there are baseball games at night at the new highschool fields--you would be astonished by the sound, which is actually a long way away.

19.0

Improving the park for limited day use is a great idea--what about signs on trailheads, maybe restroom facilities? A small trailhead parking lot. That's all it needs. Also, I would appreciate learning the Parks' policy on dogs in a developed Burton Creek Park.

Finally, as California State Parks contributor, I am deeply disappointed and dismayed by the Parks process and high handed attitude toward developing this property. There is significant local opposition for serious valid reasons.

Several years ago there was a huge effort by local residents to shape the park development in an appropriate way. And, it appeared that the Parks agreed. I am astonished that in face of this the Parks now propose to ignore that input and go ahead and frankly, I am offended by the characterization of local comment, and negative opinion, as just a bunch of local neighborhood people who want the park for their own. That's just insulting.

I and many others who spend time at Tahoe have introduced people to the beauty of the property and tried to encourage its use. Our objections to the development have a serious objective basis in fact. The current proposals are totally inappropriate for development in a sensitive, populated area with serious fire, environmental and traffic issues.

Sincerely,

Carol G. Pollock
25 King Avenue

Piedmont, CA 94611
Phone: (510) 654-2111
Fax: (510) 547-7260

From: Michael Ramicone <mistermr@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/28/2005 4:23:14 PM
Subject: Proposed Burton Creek State Park

Ken, I've taken my time sending you these notes because I wanted to do a little home work first. I have spent the last three weeks visiting and in some cases camping at all the State parks in the Tahoe Basin and those in the surrounding National Forests. Included are camp grounds at Frenchman's Lake, Davis Lake, Bucks Lake, Almonor Lake, Sardine and Gold Lakes and the Robinson Creek campgrounds up above the Bridgeport Area. In addition I stomped around in the Burton and Conservancy lands behind my house. These are the areas I have just now visited. There are many more that I and my wife have used throughout CA. during the years and still use such as the Coastal Parks and down in the Mammoth and Bishop areas.

My observations are that all are over used and abused. Erosion is in evidence with the expected runoff into existing water sources (not all into water supplies), some have restroom facilities that are of the outhouse vault type where others have flush toilets, most have potable water stations with or without proper drainage receptacles under the faucets, most do not have adequate BEAR proof food storage units, most have paved roads with paved campsites for autos etc. I could go on but you must be aware of most of this, but I want to apply these notes to the proposed Burton Creek Campground.

First let me tell you that I was adamantly opposed the the Campground as first proposed. I no longer am and thank you for the informative presentation at the High school. You might note, however, contrary to our local papers Editor a check of the names on the many petitions would disclose that the existing trails were not made exclusively by us locals. Those lists have folks from all over the USA, CA, and Europe. Those folks found out about these lands from us locals who are willing to share with all.

The entrance to the proposed park should be in the area of the Timberland Lodge. The Lodge is at the end of the present commercial corridor and close to the town.

The roads and campsites should be paved and drained in a manner to avoid erosion from runoff.

I would suggest no more than 100 campsites placed in two separated clusters of 50 each.

Potable water with proper drainage stations and flush toilets tied into the existing sewer system if possible.

A shower facility, either portable or fixed, along the lines of those found in some of the existing Parks. I

suggest this be a pay as you use facility to defray any costs involved in care and upkeep.

A convenient facility for the disposal of the campers grey water and waste dump. These could be built into the toilet facilities as a possibility.

Forget the traffic requirement. Don't take this wrong but that is stupid. All one has to do is look at the developments around the Basin, Truckee, and the efforts of the Tahoe Resort Assoc. to bring more people into the town, to realize that your 100 campsites are not significant in the overall traffic problem and its solution.

I would suggest you contact Amy Green at the County of Placer Dept. of Public Works Truckee Office to coordinate water runoff problems with their present effort. She and a crew were out in our area today working on that very problem. The office phone # is 530-581-6234, and her e-mail is agreen@placer.ca.gov.

I hope this contributes to your efforts to establish a campground in Burton Creek.

Michael Ramicone
3042 Highlands Dr.
Tahoe City, CA.

From: Michael Ramicone <mistermr@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/28/2005 7:08:20 PM
Subject: Proposed Burton Creek State Park

20.1

Whoops Ken, must have had a senior moment. The entrance to the proposed park should be in the area of Tamarack Lodge not Timberland. Timberland is even in another state.

20.2

Also my wife had some druthers as well. She said to place all campsites away from any homes no matter where you are placing them. Not in anyones backyard, here or anywhere in the state. She also recommends that the CTC Dollar Property be preserved in its natural habitat with hiking and biking with day use facilities only.
Reference the Messenger Newsletter #6 February 2002.

Thanks Michael Ramicone
Phone 530-583-1209

From: Elizabeth Dugan <elizabethdugan@yahoo.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/27/2005 12:40:11 PM
Subject: Burton Creek Drive Plan

Mr. Anderson-
I oppose the plan to develop Burton Creek Drive area.
As a home owner off Old County Road, I feel strongly
that the additional traffic and "campers" will destroy
the delicate balance of people to nature we currently
experience in the woods off the Burton Creek area.
There is also a huge fire danger in that area.
Please reconsider. There are plenty of camp grounds
between Truckee and Lake Tahoe.

Sincerely
Elizabeth Dugan
POB 5992
3705 La Crosse
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

21.0

July 14, 2005

This is a response comment to the Burton Creek State Park General Plan and draft EIR. Please include the following comments in the next revision, or alter the plan accordingly.

1. We believe the potential Admin. Building Site shown or proposed on the CTC Dollar Property should be removed. It seems obvious that if the State Parks is in need of such facilities they can construct them on the TSRA in Tahoe City. That land is on both sides of Highway 28 and is clearly accessible and already substantially impacted and man modified by previous and current State Park activities. It makes no sense to plan to do rehabilitation work on a very accessible location in Tahoe City and then destroy a fairly remote and natural location that is on the border of your proposed Reserve, which you may some day need rehabilitate that site as well.

22.0

2. We request that you remove the alternate access road on CTC Dollar Property. To encircle a substantial amount of the Park with all the traffic the Park would generate seems to substantially degrade the reasons for the Park in the first place. We would hate to hike for hours just to cross a major paved road full of cars possibly more than once. It is also much longer than the proposed access road or many other routes that could be the alternate access road. Your current alternate access cuts through your proposed Dollar Reserve more than once, then crosses through one or both the Antone and the Burton Creek Reserves. It also looks like the proposed campground is just as good or better if moved 1 mile to the south on the largest flat area in the Park. This would make the alternate access road even longer and the proposed even shorter. If you must show an alternate access road, choose one out of Tahoe City or Rocky Ridge. They appear to have their own problems, but we don't believe as many as the current proposed alternate access road. This alternate access road should not be identified at all not even as the fall back plan.

3. We oppose campgrounds all together but if they can not be eliminated from the plan entirely, the proposed location or a location 1 mile to the south of the proposed location appears to be the least objectionable. Please remove the alternate campground location from the CTC Dollar Property. It is clear that they are there to justify the alternate access road and should be removed along with the alternate access road. If an alternate campsite is necessary, a location approximately 1 mile to the south of the proposed campsite should be evaluated.

Sue and Gregg Henrikson

Comments for Burton Creek Master Plan

By Mike Schwartz – owner of The Back Country

The Back Country has 2 stores, in Tahoe City and Truckee. We specialize in cycling, Backpacking/Hiking, Backcountry Skiing, and Snowshoeing.

You mentioned that these comments would remain public record, and actually be shown to others in some way. I hope this is true.

Burton Creek State Park has mostly been used by cyclists for decades. Some folks walk the trails from the Highlands and Nordic Center, including me. I live on Polaris Rd. But even over there it's at least 50% bikers. Other than the trails close to the Nordic Center Parking Lot, I've never seen a single person walking anywhere else in Burton Creek State Park. I've never run into one person walking on the Rim Trail within the Burton Creek State Park Boundaries. I have been on HUNDREDS of bike rides through this area, usually covering every single trail in each ride. Don't read me wrong; I want hikers to start enjoying it back there. My point is more just "for the record". Please write down somewhere in the history books this absolute FACT. Although the trails and roads aren't that fun to ride, Burton Creek State Park has been primarily a place to ride your mountain bike. Anyone who ever chooses to debate this, and claim bikers are in appropriate, or problematic in this area, has never stepped foot in the area. This is an important point to make in the new Burton Creek Master Plan.

23.0

Burton Creek State Park is the perfect place for mountain biking. You can't ride your bike inside a Wilderness Area, and this land designation is likely to continue growing over time. This Park has the perfect topography for bike trails, and no erosion or trail damage has ever been created in the area from bikes.

RV Campgrounds issue**23.1**

Ken says NO Master Plan will be accepted without a 0-200 potential RV campground. He says a draft was strongly denied recently, that showed no RV campground facility. The park isn't much of a "park". It is a sad waste of prime recreational land, immediately adjacent to one of the most beautiful places in the world. I want to see the trails, signs, and trailhead work finally go in. Ken says no trail work will EVER happen at all unless a master plan is accepted. I am left to believe this as the truth, so I will strongly support a campground element of Burton Creek State Park. But if millions of dollars are spent on RV Campgrounds before the trail system goes in, you guys will go down in the history books as the guys with some horrible names I can't type in this letter.

23.2**23.3**

Adding a new RV Campground in Tahoe City has absolutely nothing to do with the needs of Locals or Tourists, nor is it healthy for Lake Tahoe or Burton Creek State Park. I'm not against RV people. I want an RV myself. But you know as well as I do....an additional campground out on I-80 or Hwy 89 is all you need to throw together. It would be just as filled up for the season and help satisfy this "demand" you keep talking about. Like people don't have enough places to drive there RV's to...you guys are telling me they MUST drive right to the edge of sensitive lake Tahoe, and turn left into the local trail

system we all use. Umm....I doubt it.

I have ridden every trail and fire road in the Burton Creek and surrounding area for 12 years. I have ridden every trail 100 times, in every possible direction. I have also directed my customers on mountain bike rides daily in my business for 12 years. Our store is located right in the middle of Tahoe City. I've personally drawn maps on paper 1000 times, and handed out another 1000 home-made maps to Tahoe city locals and tourists. Every time is the same 20 minute struggle to explain how to get through the Burton Creek area to get to the only trail that's longer than a few hundred yards, which is the Tahoe rim Trail. The only trail in the Tahoe Basin that gets any maintenance at all! People want to go to from Tahoe City to Watson Lake and Watson Peak by trail. Sorry to repeat myself, but creating a real trail system is 100 times more important than adding campgrounds.

23.4

If you build a campground, you cannot create more traffic. Read the lengthy documents created for the NLTRA, by private party researchers. Traffic is the NUMBER ONE complaint of both tourists and locals.

23.5

Another issue your potential campground plan must include is NATURAL SCREENING BY LOCATION SELECTION. This thing better remain very hidden. You will destroy the backcountry experience of Burton Creek State Park forever, if hikers and bikers have to look at RV's, pavement and buildings along the trails. It's not easy to hide 50-200 RV's and the yard sales associated with each one.

In order of what you need to do with this property is:

23.6

1. make a trailhead in downtown Tahoe City, and sign a trail all the way to Mt. Watson Peak. This is the most important function of Burton Creek State Park. Get you up the hill to a place where there is a view. No one needs to drive up this hill. Make them park that thing and walk or ride a bike for crying out loud. This trail must contour with minimal switchbacks, and be designed for mountain bikers as well as hikers.
2. Sign a trailhead at the other locations I saw on your map, and sign a route on existing trails that circles the terrain through the Nordic center and Antone Meadows. This will be the easier of the 2 trails. These are not new routes; this is what has been going on for decades. Just turn some fire roads back into trails, and put up a few signs.
3. Influence USFS to help you accomplish this, as some of the necessary trails are on their property.

23.7

4. If you do build a campground, you must build a paved road up through Star Harbor, which facilitates bike riding as well as RV traffic. It needs to have a BIKE LANE. The bike paths are way too crowded, almost dangerous. And campers will all have bikes as well. If you must have a campground, I like the proposed location I saw on the most recent map. It would be great to extend a PAVED BIKE PATH fork to the left, just before you reach the actual campground, which joins the Fibreboard Freeway. Now we have a paved bike ride from Tahoe City to

Brockway Summit. NO CARS ON THIS.

- 23.8 5. DO NOT DESIGN A CONNECTION FOR AUTOS OR I WILL KILL ALL OF YOU. If Campers start driving on the fibreboard freeway towards Watson Lake, you have just successfully ruined this entire area...and given the land to the campers for the summer. Okay, I'm just kidding about killing you. I think. But I can't promise you any protection from the thousands of Tahoe backcountry lovers who will agree with me. It would be totally dangerous, in appropriate, and just plain DUMB. Nevertheless, it's exactly what the campground manager is going to want the second you pave him a little home next to this paved backcountry route. I have seen many bikers dodge speeding cars back there, as tourists race around the fibreboard freeway, gaining access from Brockway Summit. There is nothing to see except trails between Watson Lake and Tahoe City. I'm okay with cars going from Brockway Summit to Watson Lake, because trails don't intersect other than in one spot near the start. The stretch from Watson Lake to Tahoe City needs to be protected.

23.9 Please NEVER consider concessions in this state park. The business community is the only group of locals who are allowing you to go through with this project. We do NOT need more competition. Bike rental income keeps the bike stores in business, as they lose money for the other 9 months each year. Tahoe City needs improved food options, no one makes enough money to be competing with State Parks on this level either. Concessions should only be allowed in any state park when they are necessary, due to driving distance to such needs. This is not the case here. If you're going to mow down trees, and create more traffic, and collect RV Campground revenue, you need to have some respect for the communities businesses.

Thanks for all your hard work. Please improve this area. It is long overdue. Good luck!

Sincerely,

Mike Schwartz
The Back Country
Po box 6706 Tahoe City
530-362-0020
mike@thebackcountry.net

From: "Doug Greenwood" <doug@alpensoftware.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/26/2005 7:35:12 AM
Subject: Preliminary General Plan: Burton Creek, Public Comment

Ken,

I'm a resident of Tahoe City, Dollar Hill area.

I've reviewed the General Plan for Burton Creek, reviewed the maps and approve of your "Proposed" General Plan for the State Park.

24.0

I overwhelmingly support the "Proposed (preferred) Access Road", but strongly oppose the "Alternative Access Road". Too much wilderness is at stake, plus it appears to encroach upon the Dollar Reservoir and Nordic Ski areas.

24.1

I strongly support both the Antone Meadows Preserve and the Burton Creek Preserve, however I do not want the Tahoe XC Nordic Center trail system compromised either.

24.2

I strongly support all trailheads and trail systems, hopefully the "logging roads" will be converted to single track.

24.3

I strongly support the Proposed (preferred) campground location, but strongly oppose the alternate campground locations. Reviewing the maps, it would appear that you would use the alternate access road for the 2 other alternate campground locations, and I very strongly oppose that.

Thank you,

Doug Greenwood

Alpen Software, Inc.

530-583-5822

530-320-9001 (cell)

From: "Dewey/Lynda Paul" <dewlyn@digitalpath.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/25/2005 4:53:25 PM
Subject: Burton Creek/Dollar Properties

25.0

PLEASE do not change the Burton Creek State Park to overnight camping or annex the Dollar (conservancy) Property. Tahoe is so overwhelmed with people as it is. We can hardly get from one place to the next because of traffic congestion (which causes air pollution) as it is. There are already enough places for people to camp overnight - we do NOT need anymore! The area you are talking about is pristine, peaceful, remote and already has a high use without any development. Why would anyone want to bring more people, dogs, bikes, garbage, cars, or noise into there? We beg you not to do this - Let's save what undeveloped land we have. The millionaires are ruining Tahoe with their big mansions and docks into the lake - let's not be like them. Keep it for the ones that are willing to walk to find tranquility and therefore appreciate where they are and take care of it!

Thank you,
Dewey and Lynda Paul

From: "Laurie Gregory" <lauriegregory@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/20/2005 7:42:34 AM
Subject: Burton Creek Park

26.0

26.1

I was upset to read the plan being proposed for the park. I thought they had looked at this last year or so and had decided to keep it small with a few parking places and that was it. Now it seems the state parks wants to ruin all the untouched space around Tahoe if they can. This area is a wonderful wilderness feeling space, but close to town and housing so locals and tourists alike can get a "woods experience" without having to drive or hike/bike long distances. I can see putting in a parking area, small though, and maybe some signage but all the campground ideas and roads into this area would basically ruin its charm and use as a great escape from roads, traffic and too many people. I thought the parks would want to conserve as much space as possible, keeping it "back to nature" so people have a different experience from city life, rather than making everything into parking lots. It is so disappointing to read this plan as I thought it had been resolved a while back and now looks like everything else in Tahoe with overbuilding and overuse. This area is used extensively as it is for hiking, biking and XC skiing and snowshoeing in the winter by locals and tourists alike. I was able to take my 85 year old mother on a small "wildflower hike" because this area is so accessible and if it were to be ruined with roads and campgrounds that would not have been possible. I hope you reconsider these extensive, overbuilding of the wilderness area plans and preserve this area as it is. Not everything has to be remodeled to be better. Mother nature knew what she was doing and man cannot always improve on that. Please allow some natural areas to remain just that, natural. They are still available to all who want to find them. I would hope the parks service's first job is too conserve the parks, not develop them and ruin what little natural space is left. Please keep me informed of what is happening and who else to email or contact to try to preserve this space. Thank you for considering the opinions of those who love and use this area on a regular basis.
Laurie Gregory

From: "Nancy Wells" <kemana@earthlink.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/21/2005 9:58:26 PM
Subject: Burton Creek proposal

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our very important feelings about the proposed Burton Creek campground. My family and I use the Nordic center almost daily in the winter and ride our mountain bicycles or hike in the summer frequently in the same area. We are adamantly against the proposed campground for the following reasons:

27.0

Safety: Who will monitor the campground when the budget for rangers has been cut drastically and DL Bliss Campground is down to one ranger. Has the location of a campground adjacent to schools and summer camps been fully evaluated? I would not want my children near a unsupervised campground.

27.1

Paving: Do not add more pavement to the wilderness; we live in Tahoe to enjoy wilderness, not have more asphalt and less trees.

27.2

Traffic: Probably the biggest concern: Highway 28 cannot handle the traffic right now. For example, I sat in traffic from the Tamarack Lodge to Tahoe City for over 30 minutes and that is without the added traffic of RVs and a minimum of 300 more people.

Planning: People will not walk to town for their groceries and walk back up the mtn to their campsite; this is California and the US, not Europe. Your idea of people walking to town, not driving and adding to the pollution and traffic, is not realistic.

27.3

Short Season: Our summer this year started in late June and could be over by Labor Day; that is less than 3 mos when the campgrounds would be open. You should not pave and ruin our paradise for 10 weeks of camping; We have to pay with the pollution, traffic, danger to our families, and ruination of a wonderful spot for people that will not respect our neighborhood, our children. Do not, repeat, not, build this campground. Thank You. Nancy Wells

Nancy Wells
kemana@earthlink.net
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

From: Charlie Banfield <charliebanfield@yahoo.com>
To: <kande@parks.gov>
Date: 7/19/2005 12:29:54 PM
Subject: Burton Creek

The idea of a park in that forest is a bad one.

28.0

In addition to destroying a beautiful natural area it will increase traffic in an already congested area.

The past has proven that campers are a major cause of fires.

Mr. & Mrs. Charles Banfield
Mr. & Mrs. Richard Banfield

Start your day with Yahoo! - make it your home page
<http://www.yahoo.com/tr/ns>

From: "nurpu" <nurpumike@hotmail.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/18/2005 6:21:26 PM

29.0

As a resident of N Tahoe for 15 years I am absolutly disgusted with the plans for BCSP. Leave it as it is.